

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

Wednesday, 14th March, 2012

The decisions contained within these minutes may not be implemented until the expiry of the 5 working day call-in period which will run from Friday 16th March to Thursday 22nd March. These minutes are draft until confirmed as a correct record at the next meeting.

Present:

Councillor Paul Crossley	Leader of the Council
Councillor Nathan Hartley	Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Youth
Councillor David Bellotti	Cabinet Member for Community Resources
Councillor Simon Allen	Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
Councillor Tim Ball	Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning
Councillor David Dixon	Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods
Councillor Roger Symonds	Cabinet Member for Transport

165 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair was taken by Councillor Paul Crossley, Leader of the Council.
The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

166 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

167 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillor Cherry Beath.

168 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There were none.

169 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

The Chair announced that an item to consider the West of England Planning Toolkit had been added to the agenda under the Special Urgency provisions in the Council's constitution, with the agreement of the Vice-Chair of the Planning, Transport and Environment PDS Panel. The report had been published with the Agenda and the Cabinet would consider the issue at Item 21.

170 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 6 questions from the following people: Councillors Colin Barrett, Tim Warren (2), Geoff Ward, Martin Veal; Member of the Public Hugh Mackay.

[Copies of the questions and response, including supplementary questions and responses if any, have been placed on the Minute book as Appendix 1 and are available on the Council's website.]

171 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

Councillor Brian Simmons made a statement and presented a petition of 54 signatories relating to parking at St John's Court, Keynsham. He was concerned that there appeared to be no enforcement of the signs put up by Somer, who owned the road, and appealed to the Cabinet to take steps to adopt the road and to put in a suitable parking scheme which the police can enforce.

The Chair referred the statement and petition to Councillor Roger Symonds for consideration and response in due course.

Hugh Mackay made a statement relating to Haycombe Crematorium *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website]* during which he presented a petition of 4862 signatories who objected to the removal of the cross from the window of the crematorium.

The Chair handed two further petitions, supporting the same view, containing a total of 34 signatures, and asked the Democratic Services Officer to add these to the petition pack. He referred the statement and petition to Councillor David Dixon for consideration and response in due course.

Graham Duke (Pastor, Stepping Stones Church) made a statement relating to Haycombe Crematorium *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website]* in which he referred to the rich Christian tradition of the city of Bath and observed that the cross was a potent symbol of hope for many people, especially in times of loss. He urged Cabinet not to allow it to be removed from the crematorium window.

The Chair assured the speakers that there would be a cross in the crematorium after the renovations. He referred the statement to Councillor David Dixon for consideration and response in due course.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson made a statement on the subject of the handling of the many petitions about Radstock which have been presented to Cabinet and Council. She felt that the petitions had not been given the attention which the large number of signatories should have warranted. She also observed that there had been no road traffic safety audit before the works which were due to start the following Monday.

The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Roger Symonds for consideration and response in due course.

Julie Trollope (Chairman, Bathwick Estate Residents' Association) made a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website]* expressing her concern about the proposed cycle route along the passageway between Bathwick Street and Powlett Road.

The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Roger Symonds for consideration and response in due course.

Cynthia McNally made a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website]* in which she expressed her objection to the proposal to allow cyclists to use the passageway between Bathwick Street and Powlett Road. She felt that the safety of pedestrians would be at risk if cyclists were to ride through the passageway.

Councillor Roger Symonds asked Cynthia McNally whether she was aware that a petition of 100 signatories had been received asking for shared use to be allowed along the passageway, and that the decision which he was being asked to make as Cabinet Member for Transport would ensure that the issue would be brought back to a Full Cabinet meeting for further consideration at a later date.

Cynthia McNally thanked Councillor Symonds for this assurance.

Amanda Leon (Radstock Action Group) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*] in which she asked what had happened to the idea of "regeneration" in Radstock, since in her view none of the changes being made would deliver regeneration and some would threaten the future of the town.

The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Cherry Beath for consideration and response in due course.

The Chair agreed to allow an *ad hoc* statement from Edgar Evans. Mr Evans referred to the strength of feeling about the cross at Haycombe Crematorium. He appealed to the Cabinet to retain the cross in the window. He expressed his concern that the plans had come to light not through consultation but through a short story in the local press. He felt that there had been no consultation and no debate on the issue.

The Chair said that Councillor David Dixon would be meeting with local church leaders to discuss the issue.

172 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Nathan Hartley, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 8th February 2012 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

173 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

174 CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

There were none.

175 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Chair observed that the report showed a Single Member decision taken by Councillor Roger Symonds under the Special Urgency provisions in the Council's Constitution relating to the purchase of Travel Smart Cards. He confirmed to Cabinet that the Vice Chair of the relevant PDS Panel had agreed the urgency of the issue, following advice from the Council's Monitoring Officer, Section 151 Officer and Chief Executive.

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

176 AWARD OF NEW CONTRACTS FOR BATH PARK AND RIDE BUS SERVICES

Councillor Neil Butters in an *ad hoc* statement thanked the Cabinet for extending the Park and Ride service to Sunday opening. He emphasised the importance of late night opening too and appealed to Cabinet to conduct a feasibility study to explore this.

The Chair referred to Appendix A of the report, which had been the subject of a Public Interest Test. He asked the Cabinet to agree that the document was exempt from publication.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Roger Symonds, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that Appendix A is an exempt item and is not for publication, by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

[The Chair then asked Cabinet members to agree not to refer to the exempt appendix during the debate and all agreed.]

Councillor Roger Symonds introduced the report. He observed that the 8-year contract on offer had attracted a number of bids. He referred to paragraph 5.1 of the report, which explained that the basis of the contract had been changed from gross to net, which bidders had also found attractive. The proposals would ensure no fare increases until April 2013, and never longer than 15 minutes between buses. He promised to explore the request made by Councillor Neil Butters and explained that, although late night service would not prove too expensive, it would require planning permission and would take some time to arrange.

Councillor Symonds moved the recommendations, which he said were a good deal for local people, especially for those who lived in north east Somerset who would benefit greatly from the improved Park and Ride service. He thanked the report author, Richard Smith (Senior Public Transport Officer) for the work he had done towards achieving the best deal.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal. He felt that this was a very good deal, which would save the Council £200K and at the same time would deliver extra facilities, especially during special events.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(2) To NOTE the tender prices received as set out in Appendix A; and

(3) To AGREE the award of contracts as recommended in the report.

177 BATH TRANSPORTATION PACKAGE BUS SHELTER STYLE, PROPOSED ENGAGEMENT

Councillor Roger Symonds introduced the report by explaining that the cost of the proposed shelters would be met by the funding from the Bath Transportation Package. The number of shelters had been doubled to 180, all of which would have proper seating. He thanked all those who had responded to the consultation about the design. He moved the recommendations from the report.

Councillor Tim Ball welcomed the upgraded bus shelter style and seconded the proposal.

Councillor David Dixon proposed an amendment to the recommendations, the effect of which would be that consideration would be given to installing litter bins at or near to each bus stop. The amendment was accepted by the proposer and seconder.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Tim Ball, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To CONFIRM that the preferred shelter design options identified in the public consultation namely, green shelters, sloped roofs and bench style seats are to be procured for installation on the 9 bus routes which form a part of the Bath Transportation Project; and

(2) To AGREE that consideration should be given to installing or re-installing a litter bin at each bus stop, in conjunction with neighbourhood services, to match the design of the bus shelter.

[Clause 2 was the result of an addition proposed by Councillor David Dixon and accepted by the proposer and seconder of the primary motion].

178 OPTIONS FOR THE DESIGNATION OF AN ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION ON HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION

[The Chief Executive, John Everitt, left the meeting at this point]

Jacqui Darbyshire read a statement on behalf of David Cox (Policy Officer, National Landlords Association) *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website]* in which he argued that additional licensing would not work; Article 4 Direction would reduce house prices and increase competition among tenants; enforcement should be concentrated on rogue landlords; but supported the idea of landlord accreditation

Councillor Tim Ball asked Jacqui whether she believed everyone had a right to live in a quality home. Jacqui replied that she did believe this, and that it included students and families.

Councillor June Player in a statement appealed to Cabinet to do all in its power to ensure that Bath would retain community spirit in mixed communities of HMOs and local families, without a clash of lifestyles.

Councillor Tim Ball asked Councillor Player to describe the community spirit in areas of high HMO presence. Councillor Player said that her experience was of a very much reduced sense of community spirit. She praised those students who did voluntary work during their stay in Bath but was despondent about the lifestyle clashes which made life unhappy for some families.

Mark Rose (Planning Consultant for University of Bath) made a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 8 and on the Council's website]* emphasising that HMOs are an essential source of housing for young people including graduates, young professionals, key workers and contract workers as well as students. Any action by the Council which might force these groups of people to live outside the city would have an adverse effect on the local economy. The university's position was that the issue was about the management of properties, and this issue could be resolved with cooperation between the Council, universities and other stakeholders and did not require an Article 4 Direction.

Naomi Mackrill (Vice-President, Community and Diversity, University of Bath Students Union) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 9 and on the Council's website]* objected to the apparent blame being put on students for problems being caused by the lack of housing in the city. She said

her student colleagues would make statements which together would present the view of students from both universities.

Chris Clements (Vice-President, Sport, University of Bath Students Union) argued in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 10 and on the Council's website*] that the solutions proposed in the report would not in fact solve the social and community cohesion problems but in some cases would tend to make matters worse. He said that this was acknowledged in the report, which undermined the report's recommendations.

Councillor Tim Ball asked Chris whether he believed it was right to turn a family home into dormitory style accommodation. Chris replied that the right thing would be to respond to the needs of the whole community and this was reflected in the market. Student accommodation was not a bad thing.

David Cameron (Vice-President, Activities and Development, University of Bath Students Union) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 11 and on the Council's website*] said that enhanced planning policy would not address the problems associated with the bad management of HMOs and that the report provided no evidence to show that it would. He also argued that the area did not suffer any "special circumstance" which would warrant the use of the powers.

Peter Davies (student, University of Bath) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 12 and on the Council's website*] quoted the equality impact assessment from the report, which stated that the two groups of residents who were most likely to suffer as a result of the proposals were those on low incomes and students. He argued that the Cabinet should not limit the supply of affordable housing by adopting the proposals.

Councillor Tim Ball asked Peter whether he approved of a recent situation in which a garage had been converted into a flat, with no cooking facilities. Peter responded that he would not himself choose to live in such facilities, but felt that it was a matter of individual choice.

Matt Benka (Vice-President, Education, University of Bath Students Union) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 13 and on the Council's website*] said that the cost to the Council of implementing the proposals was unknown and could turn out to be a costly mistake. He observed that the Bath Chamber of Commerce opposed the proposals because they would cause a reduction in the supply of accommodation, and a resulting increase in price. This in turn would result in an exodus of young talent in the city.

Councillor Tim Ball asked Matt whether he agreed that the Council had a responsibility to ensure that everyone had a safe, comfortable home to live in. Matt said that it was the responsibility of the Council to use its funds to solve the problems, not to make them worse or ignore them.

Simon O'Kane (Post-Graduate student, University of Bath) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 14 and on the Council's website*] emphasised the wide range of people who appreciated being able to live in HMOs in the city. He knew a number of young professionals, post-graduate students, undergraduates, mature students, as well as groups of young people who grew up in Bath. He stressed that the proposals would negatively impact on these people without solving the problems described in the report.

Councillor Tim Ball asked Simon whether he felt that the University was doing enough to help students to live in purpose-built accommodation off-campus. Simon said that projected figures were that the university would be able to provide 1200 purpose-built places by 2020, but the unfortunate reality was that this would not be nearly enough to meet the growing demand.

Amy Stringer (Vice-President, Activities and Participation, Bath Spa University Students Union) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 15 and on the Council's website*] referred to the transport difficulties for students forced by the proposed measures to live further from campus. A vastly improved transport network would be required as a direct consequence of the Article 4 Direction. She alluded to the particular safety concerns of women students returning late at night to their accommodation.

Councillor Tim Ball asked Amy whether she was aware that Article 4 was not retrospective. She acknowledged that she was aware of that.

David Howells (President, University of Bath Students Union) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 16 and on the Council's website*] referred to the requirement that special circumstances were required before an Article 4 Direction could be implemented, but the report had failed to demonstrate that any special circumstances existed. He felt that Article 4 would discriminate against the young and the lower paid in the city and would lead to a loss of talent from the local economy.

Councillor Tim Ball asked David to confirm, if the Cabinet decided to go ahead with the proposals to consult for a year, whether the student community would work with Cabinet to resolve the issues. David assured Cabinet that the student community would eagerly engage with the Council in this way, but emphasised that it would be difficult to do so if Article 4 had been imposed.

Phil Irvine (University of Bath) made a statement in which he emphasised that the policy would discriminate on the basis of age, income and marital status. He felt strongly that the proposals should not be implemented.

Anthony Masters (University of Bath) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 17 and on the Council's website*] pointed out that the adoption of Article 4 would have impacts on student nurses, trainee doctors, young professionals and students alike. He said that the reasons stated for recommending Article 4 to Cabinet were that high-density student communities prevented social cohesion, but the Council's own study found that there was no evidence of any link between the density of HMO accommodation in a community and the levels of littering or anti-social behaviour. He also reminded the Cabinet that the Council already had powers of inspection over HMOs and that the police could be called in cases of individual anti-social behaviour. He asked Cabinet to reject the proposals.

Sam Baldwin in an *ad hoc* statement explained that she was a working mum. She had been a student herself and had lived in a number of HMOs – but there had always been a good mix of family homes and HMOs in each street. She had lived in Oldfield Park for 6 years and had experienced anti-social behaviour on a number of occasions, at all times of the day and night. She appealed to the Cabinet to create a more balanced mix of HMO and family housing in Oldfield Park.

Councillor Tim Ball asked Sam whether she could distinguish between a well-managed HMO and an absentee landlord HMO. She said that it was easy to tell the difference – the house next to her own was let by an agent and it was a nightmare for her. She related some of her recent experiences.

Councillor David Dixon asked Sam whether parking was an issue. She replied that during term time, parking in her street was usually impossible which meant she had to walk from streets away, with a young baby and shopping bags.

Emma Broughton made an *ad hoc* statement as a resident of St Kilda's Road. She said that there had been a huge change to her area as a result of increasing numbers of HMOs. She felt that more halls of residence should be built on campus.

Councillor Will Sandry in an *ad hoc* statement acknowledged that students want and need a wide choice of accommodation. He reminded the universities that they had a corporate social responsibility not to take on more students than could be accommodated. He reminded the Letting Agents and landlords that the proposals would benefit good landlords. He urged Cabinet to adopt the proposals in the report.

Councillor John Bull made an *ad hoc* statement welcoming the wide discussion taking place about the issue. He felt that it was right to prevent unbalanced communities and emphasised that an Article 4 Direction would not ban HMOs, it would redistribute them more widely. But he felt there were some difficulties with the proposals, because they would not improve the conditions of homes for the tenants nor the community. The solution would be to undertake a licensing approach, which would require 3-4 officers to monitor effectively. He asked Cabinet to work closely with the two universities to increase accommodation available on the campuses.

The Chair welcomed Councillor Gerry Curran (Chair of the Council's Development Control Committee) and invited him to report to Cabinet on the debate about the subject which had taken place at the Development Control Committee meeting earlier that day.

Councillor Gerry Curran said that there had been a mix of views at the meeting, but the overall view had been that Cabinet should consult and should report back to a future Development Control Committee before making any decisions on implementing Article 4. There had been particular concerns about the resource implications of the proposals. He agreed with Councillor Bull in urging Cabinet to work with the two universities to come up with solutions.

Councillor Tim Ball, in proposing the item, thanked all who had contributed to the debate. He felt that everyone deserved a quality home to live in – not a windowless garage refurbishment or a split-window bedroom. He emphasised that the aim of the proposals was to prevent too many HMOs in one small area and to allow the Council to control the quality of the accommodation.

Councillor Ball referred to paragraph 3.2 in the report, and said that the word “commitment” should be replaced by the word “bid”. He felt that the universities had not yet fully engaged with the Council, but was delighted that the students had agreed to work towards a solution. He said he would move a different proposal from the one recommended in the report, which would provide a whole year for the community to be consulted.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal and emphasised that the proposals would be the start of a long consultation, not the conclusion. He offered to visit any meeting to discuss the possible approaches to the problem.

Councillor David Dixon said that the issues were far from clear-cut. Additional licensing was supported by all stakeholders except the bad absentee landlords who would resent spending more to keep their own property in good order. He felt that doing nothing could not be an option because the problems were evident.

Councillor Roger Symonds felt that the reason for the existing imbalances in communities was because the Council had been powerless to act. He had been very disappointed that the “right to buy” and the increasing numbers of HMOs had taken many family homes out of circulation, leading to the problems discussed in the report. He was pleased that the proposal was to consult for a year before deciding whether to confirm the Article 4 approach.

Councillor Nathan Hartley said that as a member of the Student Community Partnership in his Cabinet role, he felt that there was a good working relationship with the student community. He agreed that the issues were complex and that there

was no clear cut solution, but was delighted that the proposals contained a strong consultation element.

Councillor Tim Ball summed up by explaining the steps that would be taken in the next year to consult. He encouraged all those present to engage with the Scrutiny process during the next year and to come back to Cabinet when the final decision would be made after hearing all the evidence.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED

(1) To AGREE that it is satisfied that it is expedient that development that would normally benefit from permitted development rights should not be carried out unless permission is granted for it on application;

(2) To AGREE accordingly to make a non-immediate Article 4 Direction covering Houses in Multiple Occupation in the City of Bath for the reason set out in paragraph 5.5 of the report;

(3) To NOTE that a 6-week public consultation is required under the regulations with results being considered before any implementation of the Article 4 Direction;

(4) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Planning and Transport, in conjunction with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing to undertake all steps required to bring into effect the Article 4 Direction;

(5) To ASK the Divisional Director for Planning & Transport to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document as part of the Local Development Framework to enable implementation of the Article 4 Direction;

(6) To AGREE that the representations and the results of the public consultation are considered by Cabinet in no less than 12 months from the notice of the Article 4 Direction to enable consideration as to whether the Article 4 Direction should be confirmed, abandoned or amended: and

(7) To ASK that evidence be gathered to ascertain whether the legislative conditions for introducing additional licensing can be met, and if so, undertake a 10-week public consultation exercise which will inform the designs of any such designation. The outcome of this process will be subject to a further report to Cabinet where a decision will be made whether to implement additional licensing and if so, whether all or part of the district to be subject to additional licensing for classes of HMOs specified by the Council.

[The Chief Executive, John Everitt, rejoined the meeting at this point]

179 BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING PROTOCOL

Mark O'Sullivan (Federation of Bath Residents' Associations) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 18 and on the Council's website*] welcomed the proposals but warned of the risk that the protocol might be abused, not least by those seeking short-sighted development. He said that there would be room for sharpening some aspects of the procedures and that the Federation would respond during the consultation period.

Jane Brown read a statement on behalf of Joanna Robinson (Bath Preservation Trust) [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 19 and on the Council's website*] which welcomed the consultation, especially the commitment to keep the protocol under review. She reminded the Cabinet of the Council's obligation to protect the status of Bath as a World Heritage Site.

Councillor Tim Ball said that he was delighted to have such wide dialogue. He moved the recommendations which would start the consultation process on the protocol.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

Councillor David Dixon observed that the issues were reasonably clear for parished areas, but more complex for non-parished areas and care was needed to get this right.

Councillor Tim Ball summed up by acknowledged that there were some issues still to be resolved, and that the mitigation of costs for the Council was one such area, but the consultation should still proceed.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was **RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE the "My Neighbourhood: A Neighbourhood Planning Protocol for B&NES" for public consultation;

(2) To DELEGATE responsibility to the Divisional Director of Planning & Transport, in conjunction with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing, to make graphic and minor textual amendments prior to publication of the NPP for public consultation, and

(3) To ASK that the protocol for neighbourhood planning be kept under review so that opportunities to link this process with other community engagement are fully considered.

180 RETROFITTING & SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Jane Brown read a statement from Joanna Robinson (Bath Preservation Trust) [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 20 and on the Council's website*] supporting the proposals. The Trust would have liked to see a greater emphasis on reducing energy consumption. She promised to respond in detail to the proposals.

Councillor Tim Ball thanked the Bath Preservation Trust for their involvement in the preparation of the draft document so far. He moved the recommendations.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was **RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE the Sustainable Construction and Retrofitting Supplementary Planning Document: Consultation Draft for a six week public consultation in March-April 2012;

(2) To DELEGATE responsibility to the Divisional Director of Planning and Transport to make graphic and minor textual amendments prior to publication of the Supplementary Planning Document for public consultation.

181 COMMUNITY ORGANISERS IN BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

Councillor Paul Crossley proposed the recommendations. He said that the proposals were a response to the Big Society agenda launched by government. The Council's aim was to help some community organisers become more effective.

Councillor Simon Allen seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Simon Allen, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To WELCOME the introduction of five community organisers into Bath and North East Somerset as part of the national scheme;

(2) To ENCOURAGE action to Regenerate Community Trust (RE:generate) as the local host for the scheme to work closely with local elected members, community groups, parish councils and other local forums and public service bodies to maximise the effectiveness of the initiative;

(3) To AGREE that the Council enter into a Co-operation Agreement with RE:generate as set out in the report;

(4) To ASK Officers to work with the scheme to identify service improvements and potential cost savings from improved working with the local community; and

(5) To AGREE that feedback and learning from the Community Organisers Programme and its impact locally will be used to identify opportunities for linking to existing or emerging forms of community engagement.

182 BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL STAFF VOLUNTEERING SCHEME

Councillor Paul Crossley moved the recommendations, emphasising that volunteering was an important aspect of community life.

Councillor David Dixon welcomed the report and said he was very pleased to second the proposals. He suggested that Councillors might join in with staff in volunteering through the scheme, so as to inspire others.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To ENDORSE the Staff Volunteering Scheme; and

(2) To NOTE that the Employment Committee will consider the proposal for a Council scheme at their meeting in April 2012.

183 BATH CITY CONFERENCE - TERMS OF REFERENCE

Councillor Paul Crossley moved the recommendations. He congratulated the Divisional Director, David Trethewey, for his lead on the issue. The proposals would offer a way of enabling the council to engage with all the residents of Bath.

Councillor David Dixon in seconding the proposal, said that he was looking forward to the conference planned for 22nd May which would involve residents, businesses, visitors and other organisations with an interest in the city.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To ADOPT the emerging approach to the future development of the Bath City Conference, to be kept under review so that opportunities to link this process with other community engagement are fully considered;

(2) To ESTABLISH a Steering Group with the membership as set out in the report; and

(3) To AGREE the involvement of the Council on the basis of the Terms of Reference , to be kept under review; and

(4) To AGREE that the membership and working arrangements of the forum be presented for approval at the first meeting of the Bath City Conference.

184 YOUTH SERVICE VISION & YOUNG PEOPLE'S PLEDGE

Councillor Nathan Hartley introduced the report by emphasising the Council's reputation for a building commitment to young people. He said that there had been wide consultation with young people, the youth service and other partners during the preparation of the report. There was a commitment to work closely with the voluntary sector in delivering the pledge. He moved that the vision and pledge be adopted as Council policy.

Councillor David Bellotti seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor Nathan Hartley, seconded by Councillor David Bellotti, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To ADOPT the Youth Service Vision and Young People's Pledge; and
- (2) To AGREE that both the Youth Service Vision and Young People's Pledge can be used as part of the publicity campaign to effectively communicate to young people, their parents and wider stakeholders what we aim to achieve when working with young people in Bath and North East Somerset Youth Service and the outcomes we plan to deliver and the approach we will take.

185 BLUE BADGE SCHEME

Councillor Roger Symonds, in moving the proposals, explained that the Council had consulted Equality BANES and the group had raised no objections but had supported that the aim of reducing fraudulent use of Blue Badges.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To AGREE that a £10 fee will be charged for the issue of a blue badge for all new applications, renewal applications and replacements due to loss or theft processed from 1st April 2012 and this fee will contribute to external fees and internal administration costs;
- (2) To AGREE that the basic service will be used and none of the additional options including the data entry, secure posting and fast track posting service will be specified; and
- (3) To AGREE that the additional income received is used to for the enforcement of Blue Badge abuse service using a specialist company.

186 (RULE 16) WEST OF ENGLAND PLANNING TOOLKIT

Councillor Tim Ball moved the recommendations. He explained that this was an enabling decision, which would allow the 4 authorities to work together on preparing a toolkit.

Councillor Roger Symonds agreed that the 4 authorities must be able to work together on a common toolkit, and seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Roger Symonds, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To ADOPT the West of England Planning Toolkit and report its agreement to the next West of England Infrastructure and Place Group meeting.

The meeting ended at 9.20 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services